

The Republican.

No. 10. VOL. 14.] LONDON, Friday, Sept. 15, 1826. [Price 6d.

SQUABBLES AND TRICKS OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY EXPOSED BY ITS OWN MEMBERS.

*To HENRY DRUMMOND, Esq., High Sheriff for the County of
Surrey, and Subscriber to the Bible Society.*

SIR,

I ONCE told Mr. George Garland, a worthy High Sheriff for the county of Dorset, that "public men were public marks for little men to shoot at." With this view, I call your attention to the few remarks I have to make upon the apparent decay of the Bible Society with the decay of respect for the Bible. Every part of your public character but that of the theologian, as far as I know it, carries with it the command of esteem; so here, I have no intention to express a knowledge of you beyond the newspaper report of your Bible Speech at Guildford, as published in the "Morning Herald" of Saturday last. I cannot give that speech alone to my readers, it must be accompanied with the report of the other speeches upon the same subject, and with other public notices of the proceedings of the Bible Society.

The Bible Society is clearly an association to do that for "God" and the "word of God," which "God" cannot do for himself. It will bear no other correct description. If a powerful being had written for the instruction of mankind, he ought to have extended that instruction to the extent of his power. This I do, and this every public teacher does. Had there been such a God as you describe, and such a word of that God as you describe, the Bible Society would not only have been a great presumption, but a most blasphemous institution. It would have expressed an attempt to add to the power of omnipotence, to assist a power that could need no assistance. With these prefatory observations, I proceed to copy the Report of the Guildford Bible Society Meeting:—

Printed and Published by R. Carlile, 62, Fleet-street.

" APOCRYPHA CONTROVERSY.

" Report of a Meeting, held in the Town Hall of Guildford, on the 29th August, 1826, of the Surrey Bible Society.

" The High Sheriff, Henry Drummond, Esq., having declined taking the Chair, in consequence of the charges alleged against the parent society,

" C. N. Pallmer, Esq. M.P. consented to occupy his place.

" The Report having been read by the Secretary to the Guildford Society, it was moved and seconded that it should be adopted and printed:

" The Chairman was about to put this motion, when

" The High Sheriff rose and spoke to the following effect:— He said that he considered every talent a man possessed, even the temporary rank he might hold, as a trust committed to him by God, for which he was bound to account; and he felt it due to the Meeting to state the reasons which prevented him from accepting the honourable situation of their Chairman. But before doing so he would beg to assure them that he intended no personal disrespect to the Committee in Earl-street. So far as he was acquainted with any of the individuals who composed that body, he was willing to offer them not only the tribute of his respect, but, if they would receive it, of his affectionate regard. Still, however, looking at the conduct of that Committee as a public body, he was compelled to say it had lost his confidence, and, he believed, the confidence of a large proportion of the religious public. While it was gratifying to know how many Bibles had been circulated through their means, it was equally melancholy to know that thousands and tens of thousands of pounds had been spent in adulterating the Scriptures, by circulating the lies and fables of the *Apocrypha* along with the words of eternal life. In this respect the conduct of the London Committee had been such, that, if he might be pardoned, virtually, they had been collecting money under false pretences; for, however the members of the Committee might be startled by such an assertion, such was the conduct of men who professed to inculcate the Word of God, *without note or comment*, and yet proceeded to employ the money committed to them for this purpose in adding—and not only adding, but intermingling the fables of *Tobit and his Fish* with the inspired history of Moses, the true prophecies of Daniel with the stories of Bel and the Dragon and Susanna and the Elders. Had the members of the Society been candidly informed of what was going forward, less blame would have attached to them. But, in addition to the evil of circulating di-

rectly about half a million of adulterated Bibles, was that of having studiously concealed from the public the manner in which their funds were employed. Mr. Drummond then proceeded to enlarge on the evil of circulating the Apocrypha. Under the former dispensation, God had at sundry times, and in divers manners, spoken to the fathers by his prophets; and the bush which burned and yet was not consumed, the dumb ass speaking with man's voice, or the voice of God heard amidst the thunders of Mount Sinai, proclaimed aloud that the Lord reigned a prophet among his people. But now that he had offered up his own body on the tree, and had entered heaven as the high priest of his people, he no longer manifested himself as in times past, but had left one little volume as the revelation of his will, until, as he had appeared as prophet and priest, he should come to reign as prophet, priest, and king. It was this volume of inspiration which had been adulterated by the Apocrypha; and it was with assisting in its circulation out of funds provided for the distribution of the Bible, that the British and Foreign Bible Society was charged. He confessed that the Report which had been read was of so *Anti-Apocryphal* a character, that his hostility was much disarmed; but still he thought it did not go far enough, and that some pledge ought to be required of the Parent Society that no misapplication of their funds should take place in future. In the course of the discussions on the present subject, various extraordinary facts had come to light, and it appeared that the Society had been employing various agents, such as Van Ess and Keiffer, with large salaries, without giving the slightest intimation in their balance-sheet of such an employment of the funds. The honourable gentleman made other remarks to the same effect, and concluded an eloquent speech amidst the cheers of the Meeting.

The Chairman then proceeded to put the motion, that the Report should be printed, when a considerable show of hands having been twice made, both for and against it, the Chairman expressed his opinion that the Ayes had it.

"The Rev. Daniel Wilson was then introduced as the Representative of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and proposed a Resolution intended to meet the feelings of the Surrey Society, without opposing the Parent Society, to the effect that, considering the frailty of human nature, it became the members of the Surrey Society to exercise a watchful care over the administration of the Parent Society. The Rev. Gentleman deeply deplored the division which had taken place in a Society, in which at one time nothing but the voice of love and concord had been heard. He regretted that the same feelings had not prevailed at the present meeting, which distinguished the former meetings of the Guildford Society, when all had been peace, and union, and harmony. For the High Sheriff, who had felt it his duty to animad-

vert on the conduct of the Parent Society, he entertained the highest respect, in common with every individual who knew his talents and could appreciate his virtues. But he begged the Meeting to bear in mind, that most of his censures fell not on the present, but on former Committees of the Bible Society. True, the names of three-fourths of the Committee remained from year to year the same, but still they were re-elected, and therefore we ought to forgive the past, where the Committee had erred, and hope the best for the future. The Committee had now listened to the voice of the country, and had consented to adopt Anti-Apocryphal Resolutions, which had been adopted, with much approbation, at the last General Meeting of the Society. The Committee ought not to be suspected of acting with bad faith, and they could no longer circulate the Apocrypha, without violating the pledge they had given to the public. He, therefore, exhorted the Meeting to feel that charity which hopeth all things, believeth all things, and beareth all things—to remember the frailty of human nature, and how difficult it was for large bodies in all respects to act with perfect wisdom and consistency. He trusted no further interruption to the harmony of their proceedings would this day be made, and he turned with pleasure to the contemplation of the good the Bible Society had effected. They had contributed, directly or indirectly, to the circulation of 5,000,000 copies of the Scriptures. He had also the pleasure to state, that the prospects of the Society, in different parts of the world, were most brilliant. The Rev. Dr. Marshman, who, after an absence of thirty-five years, had returned from India, for the recovery of his health, and the Rev. Mr. Thomason, who had been absent seventeen years, assured him that the prospects of Christianity in the East were glorious. If this, then, were the case, he exhorted the Members of Bible Societies to make renewed exertions in the great cause of the Bible. The Reverend Gentleman was loudly cheered during the latter part of his speech.

“ The Rev. Mr. Jerram, Minister of St. John's, Bedford Row, rose to second the motion, and went over much of the same ground as his predecessor. He said, he always had abominated the Apocrypha, and exerted himself to the utmost of his power to oppose its circulation by the Bible Society, but now that Resolutions to that effect had been adopted by the Committee, he saw no reason for withholding from them his full confidence. He begged to impress on the Meeting the evil of division, and the triumph it would give to the enemies of the Bible. He would remind them that God is love, and that he that loveth not knoweth not God. He was sure that those who were going to follow him would remember this, and that his Rev. Friend, Mr. M'Neil, who would probably offer some remarks to the Meeting, while he would speak with his accustomed earnestness, would also remember the importance of conciliation.

“ Mr. Drummond again rose, and said that he would beg to offer a few remarks on the speeches of the two Reverend Gentlemen who preceded him, and he would begin by reminding the Reverend Gentleman, who had said, in reference to this discussion, that ‘ God is love,’ that it is also said ‘ God is *truth*,’ and, therefore, while love, and union, and charity are never to be lost sight of, they are never to be purchased at the expense of *truth*. He would also tell the Reverend Gentleman (Mr. Wilson), why he distrusted the Committee, and it was this, that they had often made Resolutions before, and as often rescinded them again. He particularly instanced a Resolution against the circulation of the Apocrypha, which had been passed after long discussions, and several special Meetings, in the year 1824, and which about two months after were rescinded at an ordinary Meeting without the slightest previous intimation.

“ Mr. Wilson then rose, and inquired if the High Sheriff had been present at the Meeting alluded to.

“ Mr. Drummond replied in the negative ; when

“ Mr. Wilson said, then he would beg to inform the respected Gentleman that that Resolution was rescinded by the consent of all parties, and that it was thought better that this should be done, in order that the Apocryphal question might be more fully discussed another day.

Mr. Haldane said he rose at the request of his Honourable Friend, Mr. Drummond, to confirm the statement he had made in reference to the rescinding of the Resolution. He begged to say that he was present at the meeting of the Committee alluded to, and that it was at the close of the day, when many Gentlemen had retired, supposing nothing was to be done, that that Resolution had been rescinded. Mr. H. stated some further particulars in corroboration of Mr. Drummond’s statement.

“ The Rev. H. M’Neil then rose, and in a speech, of which we regret we can give but a very imperfect outline, arraigned the proceedings of the Committee of the Bible Society. He said he took shame to himself for not having earlier investigated the proceedings of the Bible Society—for not having sooner compared the Reports with the extracts from its correspondence, which he was sorry to say, materially differed from each other. But the fact was, he was engaged so entirely with the duties of his pastoral office, in visiting his flock, and in publishing the glad tidings of salvation, that he had not had time to attend to this duty, and it was only lately that the melancholy truth had forced itself on his mind, that while the Bible Society had been an agent of much good, it had also been the instrument of much evil. It was with inexpressible pain, that he learned not only that the Bible Society had been long engaged in adulterating the Holy Scriptures, but that salaries had been given to individuals whose labours were said to be *disinterested*; and still further, that the Society had

entered into close connection with men upon the Continent, who were not Christians—who were Infidels, Deists, and Neologists—who were not only not possessed of the Holy Ghost,—but were against the Holy Ghost—who were not only averse to pure Christianity, but were the persecutors of Christians! It was with pain that these disclosures had been forced upon him; but he found that the Bible Society had been in the habit of holding up to admiration such men, that they had refused, in many instances, to hold connection with foreigners abroad, who were known to be Christians, and avowed that they refused connection with them, because they were under persecution—thus joining with their enemies in treating them as the first Christians, and our Lord himself—was treated as the filth of the earth, and the offscouring of all things. It was distressing to his feelings to mention these things, and the thought of doing it so pressed upon his heart, that he trembled when he entered the Hall. But a friend who sat near him, pointed to the motto which hung opposite to him—“Be just, and fear not.” From these words he got comfort, and he now came forward to discharge a conscientious and imperative duty which devolved upon him. The Reverend Gentleman then went into various details, and produced various documents in proof of his allegations. It appeared that Professor Keiffer had received an annual grant of 210*l.*, and Professor Leander Van Ess, a salary of 360*l.*, and still their labour had been represented as disinterested. It appeared that there were also other agents who received salaries, and doubtless were entitled to them; but still these salaries were conceded and lumped under the general charge of expense of printing Bibles! But he confessed that while these things pressed heavily on his mind, as they were calculated to give occasion of triumph to the enemies of the Bible, he felt that they were as nothing when contrasted with the false translations which had been sanctioned by the Society, and which had been sent into the world in some cases with infidel prefaces. The case of the Strasburgh Bible was particularly instanced, where a Bible had been published by an Infidel Committee, in connection with the Bible Society, and a preface had been added ridiculing the Holy Scriptures, and treating them in a manner in which no translator would have treated Sophocles or Homer. Other circumstances were detailed in a very impressive manner by the Rev. Gentleman, and he concluded by expressing the pain he felt at being obliged to bring these things forward. It was an easy thing, he said, to sail with the stream, but to stand up for a principle, to oppose those who were friends, and to have nothing but a sense of duty for one’s support, was a very different thing. He felt it, however, to be a duty, and having discharged it, he would now propose as an amendment to the resolution, that “The Guildford Society do, for the present, withhold its funds from the Parent Society;” and having done this, he committed the cause to God.—(Loud cheering followed.)

"The Rev. Mr. Dodsworth rose to second the amendment, but was interrupted by the Chairman (Mr. Pallmer) who said that he begged to decline putting the amendment, as it had not been submitted to him, as Chairman, previous to the Meeting.—(Considerable disapprobation.)

"Mr. M'Neil said he bowed to the authority of the chair.

"Mr. Drummond protested against the conduct of the Chairman being considered as a precedent for the next Annual Meeting.

"Mr. Wilson again rose and begged to say a few words in reply. He gave credit to the Rev. Gentleman for his upright and honourable intentions, but he confessed he could hardly restrain his feelings, when he heard the agents and Committee of the Bible Society treated as men not only without the HOLY GHOST, but against the HOLY GHOST.—(No, no, from Mr. M'Neill.) 'Then,' said Mr. Wilson, 'if this be denied, the greater part of my cause of complaint falls to the ground. For the Committee, if not all spiritual men, were so generally.'

"Mr. M'Neil rose to order. He thought it was too much for the Rev. Gentleman first to misrepresent his meaning, and then to argue as if every point was given up on that misrepresentation being contradicted. His statement did not affect the character of the London Committee, but charged them with employing improper agents abroad—with patronising false translations, and with adding notes and comments of an improper nature to their foreign translations.

"Mr. Wilson resumed, and proceeded to argue upon the impropriety of condemning the London Committee unheard, and to state some facts which he thought threw a doubt on the opposite statements. But these being contradicted by some of the Gentlemen on the platform, Mr. Wilson replied that the Meeting saw there was a disagreement as to facts, and therefore recommended them to suspend their judgment.

"The Rev. Mr. Dodsworth stated a number of facts illustrative of the charges brought forward by Mr. M'Neil and Mr. Drummond, and concluded by expressing the regret which he felt at being obliged to express so strong an opinion against the administration of a Society which had so long held a distinguished place in the estimation of the religious public,

"Mr. Bainbridge, as a Member of the London Committee, said that so many things which were *false* had been stated, that he thought it unnecessary to say much. However, in reference to Mr. Owen's conduct at Geneva, he would merely say that it was impossible for the Society to employ the Christians there as agents of the Bible Society, because they were under persecution, and they employed, therefore, those whom they could get.

"Mr. Haldane said that he rose to make some observations on some of the statements of the preceding speeches, and particu-

larly in reference to the conduct of Mr. Owen at Geneva. But he begged distinctly to separate Mr. Owen, as a private individual, from Mr. Owen as the representative of the Bible Society, and acting under their orders. As a private individual, Mr. Owen would have scorned to act as he had done in the capacity of agent for the Bible Society. But when he went to Geneva, he found an intolerant and bigotted spirit of persecution in force against the Christians of that place : and finding that the Soci-nians were the most influential men, he turned his back upon the poor despised Christians, and took part with their persecutors. He had even refused to notice M. Malan, and had only admitted M. Empeytes to an interview by night, and with closed doors. Mr. H. made some further observations to the same effect.

“ Mr. Pownall exhorted the Meeting to preserve harmony. He himself had always detested the vile system of expediency pursued by the Earl-street Committee respecting the Apocrypha ; but still he was unwilling to see disunion, and he trusted the Resolutions passed at the General Meeting would in the end prove satisfactory.

Mr. Jerrani explained.

Thanks were then voted to the Chairmnn, and the Meeting adjourned.

With a copy of this, I must send you a copy of my book for “ Every Man,” to give you some better notions about God. You say, that you view a man’s rank in society as a matter of trust from God. So that, God makes Princes and Courtiers, Priests and Panders, Despots and Slaves. Be but so critical upon the subject of religion, as you are upon languages and political economy, and you will add to your wisdom. It is lamentable, that men who display admirable wisdom on all other points, should tie themselves down to the antiquated dogmas of religion : that men, who see the necessity of critical examination on all other subjects, should exclude critical enquiry upon the extensively important subject of religion.

The reader of your Guildford speech must be at a loss to determine, whether the words are to be taken in their literal sense, or whether as a piece of bitter and biting irony on the Bible and its supporters. What are we to think of the following passage?— “ While it is gratifying to know how many Bibles had been circulated through their (the Bible Society’s) means, it is equally melancholy to know, that thousands and tens of thousands of pounds had been spent in adulterating the Scriptures, by circulating the *lies* and *fables* of the Apocrypha along with the words of eternal life.” Pray, Mr. Drummond, which are the lies and fables of the Apocrypha? You instance Tobit and his Fish. Is this more or less of a fable than that of Jonah and his Fish? Allow me to

say, after deep investigation,' that every historical sentence of the apocryphal books is as well and fully corroborated as true, as any historical sentence of the received or canonical books. What will you answer, when I say, that you have no corroborating proof, that there is a sentence of historical truth in the first fourteen books of the Old Testament, or that any such a people as Jews or Israelites inhabited Palestine before the Babylonish colonization?

You complain, that the London Committee of the Parent Foreign and British Bible Society has been "collecting money under false pretences, in professing to inculcate the Word of God, without note or comment, and yet proceeded to employ the money committed to them for this purpose, in adding, and not only adding, but intermingling the fables of Tobit and his Fish with the inspired history of Moses, the true prophecies of Daniel with the stories of Bel and the Dragon and Susanna and the Elders."

Now, really, Mr. Drummond, this is rather too much to keep one serious. With the exception of the Angel, the Fish, its liver, &c. and the Evil Spirits, the tale of Tobit is a pretty Persian tale, and very rational. It is the counterpart of the history of Job and his family: and what is more, with the above exceptions or without them, it is a much more moral tale, true or false, than the inspired history of Moses. There is neither rape, nor murder, nor any of the human vices displayed, with which the inspired history of Moses abounds.

The story of Bel and the Dragon is an excellent moral tale. It exposes the tricks of the priesthood and reads a lesson to idolators that would not be amiss to be learned by Mr. Drummond. And pray what has been the late exposure of the conduct of the Committee of the London Bible Society, but another version of the story of Bel and the Dragon? The Persians worshipped Bel, or an emblem of the Sun and the Serpent; the priests of Bel gave out to the more ignorant people, that a figure of the God ate a certain quantity of food every night, or whatever that was pleasant to eat and to drink that the worshippers would leave before him. Daniel is made to expose the trick by shewing, that the Priests came through secret doors and took away the food for themselves. So with the Members of the Committee of the Bible Society, it has been found, that they have been helping themselves to large salaries from the subscriptions or sacrifices of the Bible worshippers, and this trick has been exposed by other idolators who were not making gains from the same source.

The story of Susanna and the Elders is a much prettier story than that of Ruth, inasmuch as chastity and resistance to treacherous violence is preferable to treacherous prostitution of person.

Daniel, his visions, and his lion's den, the burning unconsumed bush of Moses, the speaking ass of Balaam, and the thundering

scenes of Sinai, with the immortal God that died on a tree, are with you sublime matters; while the simple and strictly probable tales of Bel and the Dragon, Susanna and the Elders, and Tobit with its exceptions, are rejected as so much like truth, so unlike mystery, as to be unworthy of being called divine inspiration. Verily, I do think, that your speech is more powerfully infidel or antichristian than any thing that I have spoken, written, or published. The John Bull newspaper seems to view this matter in the same light; but unlike me it rejoices in the apparent dissolution of the Society. I wish the society to be coextensive with Christianity, or to go on in its assistasce to uproot it. The "John Bull" has announced with glee the approaching dissolution of "The Bible Society" on its last Sunday's placard, and the following well written article forms its comment on the subject in that day's paper:—

"THE BIBLE SOCIETY.

"WE present our readers with the following account of a late Bible Society Meeting in Wiltshire, which, for impudence and hardihood of inference, in assuming the principles entertained by our most gracious KING from those attributed to one of his Chaplains, exceeds even the usual inordinacy of presumption which characterises these itinerant quacks! Be it remembered the Report is *official*—for as more than one of the provincial editors with whom we have remonstrated on espousing the vagrant theology of these revived Puritans, have informed us, the sums paid throughout the provinces by the Auxiliary Bible Societies, **OUT OF THE FUNDS FOR THE PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION OF BIBLES**, for puffs *direct* and *indirect*, and reports of their proceedings, are so large, as to amount to one of the chief sources of revenue to the provincial press! If there is the least demur on the part of the editor whose principles may revolt at such an abuse of public credulity, the proprietors silence him by the more prevailing argument that thirty, forty, and even fifty guineas may be gained by a single article from the Biblers!! Such a contempt of the mammon of this world may abstractedly be very conformable to the principles of our holy faith, but we rather believe that even these Jesuitical casuists would be puzzled to shew any authority in Scripture for putting their hands into other men's purses as a mode of evincing their indifference to the good things of this life!

"We have said so much merely in proof—which might otherwise be well questioned—that the extract we are about to present to our readers does not merely represent what occurred at the meeting, but that the Report has passed the ordeal of a revising Committee, and been regularly connected for public presentation.

"The anniversary of the Wilton Branch Bible Society on Wednesday se'night, was more numerously attended than for several former years. In the absence of the Rev. T. Methuen, G. Atkinson, Esq. undertook the duties of chairman. A brief Report was read by the Rev. S. Hawtrey, one of the Secretaries. The details given by the Rev. A. Brandrum, on the part of the parent institution, proved that the sphere of the Society's operations was continually extending: that an ardent thirst for the scriptures was excited in every quarter of the globe; and that whatever diminution there might have been in the funds of the Society during the past year, this had by no means arisen from any serious defection of its supporters,

who on the contrary were steadfast and increasing. Mr. B. communicated to the meeting that the Bishop of Salisbury had, for 22 years, been a most zealous Vice-President of the Society; that the Rev. Dean had also long been a friend to the institution; that the loss which had been sustained by the death of the late Bishop of Durham, is repaired by the addition of the newly-elected Bishop of Llandaff to the list of Vice-Presidents; and that from the relation in which the last-named Prelate stood as Royal Librarian! THERE WAS THE FULLEST ASSURANCE THAT THE PLAN, OBJECT, AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE BIBLE SOCIETY MET WITH THE ENTIRE APPROBATION OF HIS MAJESTY!!

"We say nothing of the drift of the Society in audaciously attempting to impose upon the world as the adopted opinions of his Majesty—in direct opposition to his public acts, through which alone the sacredness of his character permits us to infer his principles of action—the sentiments of an individual who acts upon his own responsibility, and who must stand or fall by his own individual rules of conduct. But it is the fact itself which we doubt, and which we trust is the only one of those hardy assertions made in this mountebank Society, which, like a college of Jesuits, labours 'to make the worse appear the better reason,' whenever the interests of the body are concerned. We say we doubt the fact of the new Bishop (Dr. Sumner) having lent the authority of his Episcopal title to the purposes of this heretical confederacy.

"Our grounds of doubt rest, first, upon our unwillingness to believe that so young a Bishop would at once enter the lists against all the learned portion of the Bench on which he has so recently taken his seat—against the great head of the Church, and the whole body of Bishops, with such exceptions as only tend to prove the soundness and orthodoxy of the real and effective Governors of our ecclesiastical establishment; and secondly, because the same impudent trick was played off against one of the firmest and most steady pillars of our church, the present Bishop of London, Dr. Howley.

"When the Bible Society was first set on foot, the art and subtlety with which the saints and dissenters disguised the ultimate object they had in view—in short, before any appearance of its being, what it now unblushingly assumes to be, A DISSENTING CONFEDERACY against the established church, Dr. Howley, then a private clergyman, contributed a single subscription to the local purposes of the new institution. The real object of such a scheme could not be long concealed from the penetrating eye of such a man—and he declined any further subscription for purposes, and towards an object which he disapproved upon principle. Many years afterwards, when he was raised to the Bench, this honest, fair dealing Society gave the signal from the central junto in London, and blazoned forth his Lordship's name, printed, published, and circulated, in every part of the empire, as Vice-President and patron of this institution!!! In vain did his Lordship's friends remonstrate upon the fraud; it was persevered in, and we believe that this falsehood, recorded under the sanction of a Society claiming a patent for exclusive Evangelical purity, was not finally suppressed until after it had in a great measure answered the purpose of the conspirators, and the Bishop himself felt called upon to take effectual measures to repel the libel upon his dignity and character. This, we trust and hope we shall find to be the case with respect to the Bishop of Llandaff.

"Thus much is certain, that the frequent detection of intrigue, falsehood, and imposition arising out of this hot bed of 'false doctrine' and 'schism,' has, so far from having checked or retarded the system upon which the whole of the mummery and harlequinade of its principal actors

is built, that, aided by the influence of a purchased press from one end of the kingdom to the other, falsehoods and misrepresentations are impudently persevered in, which by repetition and boldness of re-assertion they oppose to authenticated facts, and the evidence of truth itself. The detection which we recorded on Sunday last, however, induces a hope that from its publicity truth may begin to operate upon those very silly and weak persons who contribute their money for an annual entertainment in a theatre or public house, consecrated and converted into arena for the grimace and buffoonery of men whose mediocrity of talent, in most instances, excludes them from the legitimate objects of professional ambition.

"It is one of those extraordinary delusions which have too frequently occurred in the history of this country—in which a Wilberforce may become extensively successful, whilst a De Maineduc and a Johanna Southcott, lacking the powers of sustenance, sink, after a blaze of popularity—not from any essential difference in the nature of their appeals to public credulity, but from the absence merely of those means which the more elevated impostor possesses of giving currency and effect to his opinions. What is impudently and arrogantly styled "EVANGELISM" in these days, is precisely, to the orthodox faith, what the Solomons, Brodums and Eadys are to the regular and scientific practice of physic!

"That in this enlightened period, as it is called by the coxcombs of philosophism, any man of real talent and education can be found to associate with a society whose only visible and deducible principle is hostility to the Established Church, and which, so far from offering any specific advantage in exchange for the rejection of the national faith, professes to encourage and receive on an equal footing every species of dissent from the Presbyterian to the Bryanite, and from the Socinian to the Muggletonian; that any really enlightened mind can, *upon principle*, lend itself to the support of such an institution, we consider to be impossible; and if we look to the prominent actors from its first establishment to the present moment, we find nothing to interfere with the conclusion to which our first judgment would conduct us.

"It may be considered the central deposit of mediocrity—where, in no single instance during the long progress of this Society, with all the incidental advantages of puffing, popular excitement, and even the spirit of emulation, has any individual appeared, above the ordinary level of every-day talent, or a single work been produced which can compete with the second-rate Divines of the Established Church!

"We are, and we have proved ourselves to be, the steady, unchangeable, and persevering friends of the Established Church—and it is with feelings of no slight suffering and regret, that in supporting such a cause, we have more than once been called upon to animadvert upon the conduct of some individuals who are supposed to be, and ought to be among the main pillars of the spiritual edifice. But we own no principle beyond that of duty—and when the enemies of the Church vauntingly throw in our teeth the growing advantages to their cause from the accession of our own Church Governors to their ranks; we cannot sheathe our weapons, because, schooled in the policy of a military archetype, they place our captive brethren in the front of their array, and scoffingly dare us to the attack. Those two or three dissenting Bishops—dissenting we mean from their brethren on the English Bench—who have suffered themselves to be thus placed, might indeed awaken our clemency, from a conviction that their conduct is founded on well-meaning but mistaken notions of duty; but such a mode of acquittal from the general obloquy, deservedly incurred by the main body, would probably be taken as an ill compliment even

from our courtesy, and we are indisposed to make any further concession, where to speak truth and in plain terms is perhaps now become necessary to the salvation of the Established Church, and even of the Constitution of our Fathers! Puritanism is abroad—revived under various forms—but vigorous, consistent, new-strung, and like a giant refreshed by long slumber. That it should be aided by Churchmen—that it should be sanctioned by a single Bishop, is among the extraordinary inconsistencies which have distinguished the “march of intellect” (DOWNWARD—Qy.) for the last thirty years, and can only be paralleled by reference to its former march, when triumphant fanaticism laid low and prostrate the altar and the throne!

“We believe that the Wiltshire orator spoke too truly, when he claimed the Bishop of the Diocese as a steady supporter of the Society for several years—and we lament it—the more especially on account of the numerous complaints which have reached us, touching his Lordship’s lack of courtesy to his own parochial clergy. We despise pride—that false and spurious pride which is rarely found in men of distinguished birth and rank, who are too proud to require the degradation of those around them as a means of sustaining their own rightful pre-eminence, and know not how otherwise to maintain it. A proud Churchman, whatever be his rank, appears to us to be an anomaly, and an anomaly against which we should feel no delicacy in designating in the strongest terms which fall within the limits of Christian charity! Every faithful servant and minister of the Church, be he high or low, stands upon one and the same platform. Subordination of rank tends to the order and well being of the whole—it places no one at such a distance from another as to weaken, much less to break the chain of brotherhood!

“We *may* be misinformed, although this is seldom the case, as we never depend upon single evidence—that we may be so in the present case we sincerely hope—but even this will not interfere with our general reasoning or with the steady conviction of what is due from one member of the Church towards another. We will only in conclusion observe that every gentleman who addresses another by letter is entitled to an answer—and that a man, who, *presuming on his rank*, SYSTEMATICALLY declines to answer those which are addressed to him, is guilty of a breach of courtesy as little defensible by the usages of mankind as it is consonant with the humility prescribed by our holy religion. But the evil does not end here—We have authenticated cases before us of Clergymen having incurred grievous losses, and of inconveniences and impediments arising out of neglect in the details of a diocese, for which no better reason has been assigned than the letters connected with them *had never been read—nor even opened!* We would only suggest, and that with all due respect to the high quarter towards which our animadversions are addressed, that if the direct duties of the most sacred office with which mortal man can be invested are too heavy to admit of being discharged with all the strictness to which they are conscientiously entitled, the portion deducted for the support and exclusion of Schismatical Society should not at least be resumed, until the sacrifice of the one be no longer necessary to the due exercise of the other.”

This article needs no comment from my pen. I have chosen here to make the Bible Advocates expose each other. The following advertisement, taken from “The New Times and Representative” (Alas! poor Representative! I pity thee for having so de-

graded thyself as to seek shelter in such company!) of Saturday last, speaks volumes as to the real character of the Bible and Bible Idolators:—

“ TO THE CHRISTIAN PUBLIC.

“ The COMMITTEE of the BRITISH and FOREIGN BIBLE SOCIETY having, for years, adopted a line of conduct utterly subversive of the Institution's fundamental laws, incompatible with the highest interests, and opposed to the loudly expressed opinion of the Christian Public; and having thereby occasioned the total separation of a most valuable part of North Britain some time since—and a further secession which was announced on Monday, in their Meeting—and also a proposition made by very highly respectable Members, at the anniversary of a County Auxiliary in the South, last week, to dissolve its connexion with the Parent Society, (a step which is meditated in other parts) unless an immediate reformation takes place in its management. A PUBLIC MEETING will be held at the Freemason's Tavern, on Friday, the 15th Instant, at Eleven o'Clock, where several Clerical Members of the Committee, as well as Dissenting Ministers, have engaged to attend, for the purpose of considering what measures may be most prudent to adopt, in the present alarming crisis of the said Institution. The Chair to be taken at Twelve o'Clock precisely.

“ N. B. There are books ready printed for the information of the company assembled, which evidently prove the truth of the above assertions, but it is thought prudent not to publish them until the result of the Meeting is known, lest Christianity should suffer through the gross errors which may most probably be again propagated, to uphold the Committee's credit, as there were in the Apocryphal controversy.”

This advertisement is full proof of the rotten and useless foundation of the Bible Society. Here is a word of God that is only to be put into circulation by knavery and fools' pence; and here are the knaves exhorting each other to beware of their conduct, lest Christianity suffer; that is, in plain language, lest God suffer. Is not this an admission, that God and Christianity are theories fabricated by such men for the gain that can be made of them? Is not gain, or the filthy lucre, the universal idol, visible, as the ruling motive in the issuers of this advertisement? The Bible Society has proved as complete a bubble as any of the Joint Stock Bubble Companies that have been lately fabricated. All the money subscribed has been money sunk by the subscribers without the production of the least effect to that end for which they have subscribed. They have circulated Bibles; but have they one Christian the more for that circulation? All were Christians before that circulation commenced; but since the commencement of that circulation, the constant cry has been—*the danger of the Church*. One of the Bishops had foresight enough to see, that the Bible Society would bring the Bible into disrepute. It is in disrepute, and the Society has done and is doing

much to accomplish it. They feel the mischief done, in their view of mischief, and each blames the other as the author. There is internal discord among these holy men. They accuse each other of corrupting the Canonical Jewish Scriptures, by circulating with them the Apocryphal Jewish Scriptures, and of misapplying the funds, in large salaries, of the subscriptions for the sole purpose of circulating the Bible. The cry of gain is raised among them: and had they been wiser, they would have seen that gain was the first motive, though a mistaken view, of forming the Bible Society. The Koran Society thrives without subscriptions. I sell the Koran; but who thinks of *buying* a Bible? From what I hear of the state of the bookselling trade in London, I infer, that I take as much money for avowedly irreligious books, as all the booksellers in London put together take for avowedly religious books. I confine the inference to the London sale and to the purchase of complete new books in the booksellers' shops. The 'Age of Reason' is the best selling standard theological book in the country. From the number of copies which go out, it must be spreading far and wide. Thus the Bible Society is not only assailed by a powerful external enemy; but it is evidently dying from the effect of internal discord. When men, working in the cause of an *omnipotent* god, that is *impotent* enough to need such auxiliaries, disagree, the circumstance is a proof that they are impostors; and the subscribers to the Bible Society will be wise to make a better use of their pence than to support such men.

Pray, Mr. Drummond, do you not think that the writer in the "John Bull" is at heart as much of an Infidel as I am? Can you see any motive in his sort of defence of the Established Church, but that of gain in the sale of his paper among a certain portion of the Clergy of that Church and those whom that portion can influence? Can you not see, that the Bible is a book, is such a word of God, that cannot defend itself, nor be defended effectually by those who support it? Have you read any critical examinations of the Bible? Have you fairly examined the controversies between the Theists and the Materialists? If not, I call upon you, as upon one whom I would fain believe to be honest, to suspend your judgment until you do examine. I invite you to come forth from this caballing, intriguing, and disgraceful body, the Bible supporters, and to distinguish yourself as a sincere searcher after truth, and as an espouser of that which, after investigation, you sincerely believe to be true.

RICHARD CARLILE.

62, Fleet Street, Sept. 14, 1826.

THE FANATICS BEAT IN NOTTINGHAM.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE the pleasure to inform you, that *the Victory is ours*, and that we have succeeded in establishing free discussion in the most fanatical and bigoted town in England. Yes, we are conquerors. Mr. Watson, when we were in Cold Bath Fields Prison, in answer to my remark, that prejudice and ignorance were so fast rooted in the minds of the people, that I feared their condition would never be better; would say, "*Oh! do not despair, perseverance on our part will work wonders.*" I have had positive proof of it in one month. When I first came to Goosegate, Nottingham, I was dared to go out by the fanatics. I defied their threats. I have gone out when there has been more than two hundred throwing their curses and prayers alternately at me; but I was well convinced, if I stayed within, it would be much worse. The most bigoted would now be my friends, would gladly form an acquaintance with me, and invite me to their houses. *Even my old landlord, Mr. Barber, has turned a customer.* The table is turned: We must proclaim peace in Nottingham. *Victory is ours.* The women are beginning to inquire, and we may soon expect to hear the greater part of them are Materialists. I have removed a few doors higher up in the same street to a more commodious house, where I hope to continue to vend useful publications without interruption. I have no doubt, but I shall yet do well. Our enemies blush at their own conduct towards me, and say, that they will now try to protect me from the more ignorant.

Respectfully,

S. WRIGHT.

Subscriptions for Messrs. PERRY, CAMPION, and CLARKE, confined in the Giltspur Street Compter, received at 62, Fleet Street, since last advertisement:—

	s.	d.		s.	d.
Mr. Bickley	2	0	Mr. Watts	2	6
Mr. Pattinson	1	0	J. P.	1	0
W. T.	3	0	Mr. Reed	1	0
W. W.	2	0	E. R.	15	0
J. E.	0	6	Mr. Clarke, Kensington	0	6
C. H. for W. Campion	2	0			

TO MR. CARLILE.

WHAT IS GOD? No. I.

Deus est quod cunque vides quocunque moveris.

SIR,

I HAVE always admired your philosophical opinions, and respected your boldness in publishing them, and I particularly like the observations on friend William Allen's pamphlet. To the question, however, that you have put to him,—WHAT IS GOD? I am now about to reply, and I trust your liberality will cause you to insert my answer, even if it should differ from your own opinion, as it is by free enquiry that truth is elicited.

There are two meanings to the word *God*, one represents the *God of Nature*, and is an inference from our perceptions of surrounding phenomena: the other is the *God of Grace* or of Superstition, and is founded on an irregular use of the imagination, and on a false view of philosophy, which priests and panders of power have converted into a bloodthirsty and nefarious traffic. With this said *God of Grace* I have nothing to do at present, I reserve the consideration thereof to another time, and I now proceed to explain my notion of the *God of Nature* or soul of the universe, and I hope that my views will be found to be strictly philosophical, as I admit of nothing in my proof of him but logical argument. When I have developed my system of the universe, I trust I shall be able to explain how the many subsidiary powers of nature came to be tributary Gods, and to form the basis of the polytheistical theology. I admit that my proofs are metaphysical in the real, though not in the absurd sense of that word. For as *Physicks* signify the science that relates to the phenomena of nature, or the things in the nature's house (from *φυσίς* and *οικος*), so metaphysics are understood to relate to the things beyond the *house of nature* (from *μετα*, *φυσίς* and *οικος*) as other words they imply a deeper research into the *causes* of phenomena.

In my enquiry WHAT IS GOD? I begin with the question, *what is matter?* Then I ask, *what is motion?* and lastly, *what is the mover?* For I hold it is evident from the whole of my experience and observation, that *matter does not originate motion, nor does motion originate itself, but that there is a source of motion in that capacity or principle that we call mind.* In this, I assure you, my old friend William Allen is correct. But in saying this, I have offered no solutions of my questions, *what is matter—what is motion, and what is mind?* Now laying aside all the false notions of the schools, all the scholastic subtilties I learned at Cambridge, and all the religious jargon with which mother church crams her

votaries, I have recourse alone to my own reasoning powers, and I ask myself—*what am I conscious of, as certain and incontrovertible, as a basis for my reasoning, as an axiom whereon to found my proofs, or as a source whereon I am to seek the solution of my questions; I begin then with sensations. I am conscious of surrounding phenomena, and the sum of my sensations is all that I can become immediately conscious of or perceive the material universe. The manner in which objects are perceived, I find to be by means of an organized nervous system, and as this said nervous system can furnish me with the sensation of objects in sleep which I mistake for realities, how then am I to know of the real existence of external objects? The answer is this: we know the objects of the external world only in their sensible qualities, or in their effects on our Sensorium, and a further investigation shows that in dreams the nervous system is called into action by stimuli, though not by the stimuli of the external objects themselves, and that similar actions being thereby excited in the nervous systems to those which external objects at first excited, we hereby see in our dreams similar phenomena, and not being at that time conscious of time and place we mistake these false sensations for their waking prototypes.*

External objects, however, impress the senses in a regular and consistent manner; instead of an irregular one, and in this regularity consists part of the proof, that external objects really exist, the rest of the proof consists in this; that we have no dreaming sensations or visions that have not had prototypes in our waking perceptions, and physiology has clearly shewn, that in both cases what the mind really perceives is, the configurations of the sensorium; though in the one case, these configurations are precisely correspondent to external stimuli, while in the other, they are illusive repetitions of them performed in the nervous system, and mistaken for realities. Hence the solution of the question, viz. *what is matter?* For matter is that, which existing externally to ourselves, is known by the effect it produces on our senses in exciting what we call sensible qualities. The rays of light excite vision, the vibrations of air, sounds, and so on. Now, as similar effects must always proceed from similar causes, and different effects from different causes, otherwise, there could be no regularity in nature, so then there must be as great a variety in external objects themselves, as there are in their sensible qualities. So that though we do not perceive external objects in themselves, but only as they affect our senses, we are, nevertheless, not deceived as to their number or variety, and thus *Matter in relation to us is all that we see, feel, and hear, in short, all that we are conscious of by sensation*; it is eternal as to time, for we cannot admit that it could ever have caused or originated itself, nor does there appear to our senses any adequate cause for its creation. Its existence is an eternal necessity: it occupies for any thing we

know, a surrounding infinity of space, and has ever existed and will exist to all eternity of time.

But matter undergoes changes by means of which individual forms are produced, matured, and displayed, and those changes of figure are effected by what we call *motion*. For, as matter cannot change its own forms, nor move itself, so there must be some other cause for this change; and the cause of this change we call motion. The solution of the second question is this, *that motion is an abstract term representing the cause of the changes of figure in matter.*

But motion cannot originate itself, nor can matter move itself without some moving agent, so that I must ascribe motion to some other source, and as I perceive in myself a capacity for motion, in what I call my mind, or the source of my volition; so by a natural process of reasoning do I ascribe motion in general to some similar principle. And the Deity, or the eternal and original mind, is regarded as the great cause or origin of all the movements of matter. Hence I can give an answer to the third question proposed, and say, *That the word God is an abstract or algebraical sign for a real or supposititious source and centre of motion for the whole universe;* and it will be found on inquiry that all the subaltern gods, the Juno, the Minerva, the Neptune of antiquity, and indeed all the gods and goddesses of all the theologies, are originally emblematical signs for the various powers of the elements—all tributaries to the *God of Nature*; and that it was not till a later period that priestcraft and superstition converted them into personified beings, subjected to an imaginative *God of Grace*, who being according to them omnibeneficent, they were obliged to create a Devil in order to account for his imperfect attempts to make all beings happy, of which the misery of the world afforded too glaring a demonstration.

Now according to this very system, God is not omnipotent, nor can he be the creator of the material universe. It amounts to this almost—that God is the Universe, and cannot alter his nature, which was the Platonic opinion, so that every thing takes place according to causes eternally and essentially operating. Thus the matter of the universe may be called, as the ancients called it, *God's body*, and the source of motion his *mind*, *ghost* or *spirit*; and motion itself the *logos*, or *fiat*, by which forms and organizations are effected, and by which he is metaphorically asserted in the Bible—to have said, *Let there be light, and there was light.* And this view affords some clue to the explanation of the trinity in unity of the Indians, Egyptians, and Christians.

Man like the universe of which he forms a part, seems to be a phenomenon resulting from three elementary causes, *Body*, or the *matter of his fabric*: *Vitality*, or a *peculiar motion in his fluids*; and a *capacity for sensation and source of motion called Mind*. And thus the metaphorical Indians, and after them the Jews and

Christians spoke of the *God of Nature*, as creating man in his own image; while priestcraft in turn created a *God of Grace in the image of man*, and endowed him with revenge, jealousy, and all the imperfections of human nature. Now as I have answered your question, *What is God?* and my own, *What is motion?* and *What is matter?* as I can know no more about it all than what I can derive from reflecting on my sensations of phenomena, I trust, imperfect as it is, that you will be liberal enough to give place to my view of God, and I hope to be able in future to send you some curious corollaries from this doctrine. *Matter, Motion, and Mind*, like *Time and Space*, are eternal and essential existences, and while I cannot solve the great mystery, *Why*, since nonentity seems possible, *there should exist ANYTHING rather than NOTHING*, I am contented to arrive, as near as I can, to a true philosophy, founded on sensations as axioms. While in order to impress it on my readers, I shall quote it in verse—

“ My Muse has taught how MIND, th’ eternal cause
Of MOTION, gives t’ eternal MATTER laws,
Thro’ boundless space how here harmonious all
By constancy make what we Nature call.”

I will proceed in my next to the etymology and present import of words used in theology, then to the history of the polytheistical philosophy, not losing sight, during the investigation, of the metaphysical question, *What is God?*

O. O.

TO MR. R. CARLILE.

DEAR SIR, Edinburgh, 6th Sept. 1826.
THOUGH I furnish your publication regularly to others, yet it frequently happens that I am behind all my customers in getting them perused. I only yesterday read the second Number of Vol. XIV. and in it I observe a letter, on which I mean to offer a few remarks; indeed, there are many subjects agitated in the pages of “The Republican” on which I feel inclined to say a little; but the constant attention which my business requires, prevents me. The letter to which I allude is one addressed by a friend in Liverpool, to Mr. James Cropper, merchant there, on the subject of West India slavery. The sentiments contained in that letter do little credit to the writer; and when published by you, without note or comment, are as little credit to “The Republican:” but judging from the abuse which has been thrown upon the leaders of Negro emancipation, by many reformers, I am led to conclude, that if they are well themselves they care very little what Negroes suffer.

I do not consider Wilberforce as a friend to the liberties of Englishmen, and probably the same may be said of many other

advocates of Negro emancipation ; but that is no reason for us to reject the good which they wish to perform ; their exertions in behalf of the Negroes cannot injure the liberties of Englishmen ; and tends to lessen human misery ; and so long as there is suffering and sorrow in the world, we should rejoice when they are lessened, although all is not accomplished that we could wish : we should not obstruct a good work, nor abuse men when performing it, although they may leave something quite as necessary undone. It is needless to abuse the abolitionists for endeavouring to promote Negro freedom, although they should neglect the reformers at home ; the abolition of slavery in the West Indies would eventually promote the cause of freedom in England. But notwithstanding the opposition of *both Reformers and Tories*, I hope that every island in the West Indies will yet become a black Republic. Every good man should endeavour to put an end to slavery there, although another ounce of sugar should never be raised in these islands.

I shall now proceed to make some observations on your Liverpool friend's letter. He says, " that the meetings which have been got up in various towns throughout the kingdom have been calculated to throw odium on the West India planters." The fears of the planters and their friends on this head, make it evident that the statements of the abolitionists are well-founded ; and that the planters deserve all the odium that has ever been heaped on them. If they are so upright and humane as their friends represent, they should attend these meetings, and defend their cause and character ; all their arguments in defence would certainly be heard, but their absence or silence seems to prove, that they are guilty ; and the statements against them prove, that they are more cruel tyrants than the Turks ; and that their slaves are in a more severe bondage than the Greeks. He says, " that there are far more urgent causes at home for our commiseration and interference than that of the *well-fed, regularly-worked, singing, dancing, and happy Negroes of the West India Islands*." There are doubtless many cases at home deserving of great commiseration ; but even the worst of our artists and tradesmen in ordinary times are not so miserable as the Negro slaves ; nor is their case so entirely hopeless. The West India slaves are driven to their work by the cart-whip, and may at any time be lashed by their drivers, without daring to resist, under pain of the severest punishment. In this country, mechanics or labourers may resist a blow from their master, and have redress by an action at law besides. Negro parents and children, brothers and sisters, are often forcibly separated, and sold off like cattle, never to see one another again : none can be used so cruelly in Britain. The West India slaves cannot leave their master, let him be ever so harsh and cruel to them : the mechanics and labourers in Britain may when their term is expired. The Negroes dare not complain

publicly when abused, nor meet to petition for redress, although their treatment be ever so hard : in Britain, the poorest individual may petition either Parliament or the King, make a complaint and at least be heard, if the wrongs are not redressed. I believe few labourers or mechanics in this country would exchange their condition with any West India slave, and in ordinary times most of them would spurn such a proposal. The condition of the slaves is so unfairly represented by your friend, that Mr. Cropper might with *equal truth* tell him, that the operative tradesmen of Manchester and its neighbourhood were *idle, drunken, and riotous, without a necessary cause.*

He says, " But granting the propriety of an abolition, of a complete change of property, is this *the time* to get up petitions; to load the table of the House of Commons with the signatures of thousands of unthinking individuals, many of whom sign by influence, and probably, who, if asked, would not know the difference between the spirituous sugar of the West, and the sweet clay of the East Indies?" Your friend seems more anxious about the quality of his sugar than he is about improving the condition of mankind. His assertion, that many sign these petitions through influence, is quite incorrect; I believe no other influence but fair statements of the case is used to procure any signatures to these petitions. The argument of an unfit time, is the same that was used by Mr. Pitt and his friends when resisting all reform; and it is equally suitable in the mouth of your friend, who seems an advocate for West India tyranny; but the man who defends slavery is an enemy to freedom, and would deserve little pity if made a slave himself.

He says, " Give a Negro an inch, and he'll want or take a fathom;" that is, give him a little liberty, and he will ask for more: and so would your Liverpool friend, or any other man in the same condition. This was a charge always made by Ministers against Reformers; it is true, and Ministers would have been the same in their condition; that feeling arises from our common nature, and is as it should be; let rulers and masters keep none in bondage, and they will have nothing to complain of on that head.

He says, " It is a well known fact, where there is one act of punishment by British planters, there are ten by the Portuguese and other proprietors, and about twenty in these isles of freedom and liberty." I consider this to be a very false assertion, and challenge him to the proof of it. When he has given his proof, I shall say something to the contrary; I do not mean to defend either the Portuguese planter or the British Government, both are bad enough, and so are the British planters, which the Negroes feel by experience.

He says, " It is a question with me, whether the Negro population of our colonies do not enjoy a greater ratio of happiness

than the majority of the labouring population of the United Kingdom; *they* are never half starved, and debilitated by fatigue and want; *they* have no care for the morrow." The constant fears of the planters, and the horrible execution of the Negroes for the slightest tumult, proves that the above question and assertion are void of foundation or truth. Your correspondent is so friendly to slavery abroad, that he cannot be a friend to liberty at home; but if he were a slave himself, it would probably change his mind on that subject; I think, in a year or two, there would be little singing or dancing in his mind, and if he had no care, he might, at least, have fears for to-morrow. He seems to consider the condition of our plodding ploughmen and sickly artists as worse than that of the slaves, and complains, "that hundreds delve below the surface of the earth, shut out from the light of Heaven." I do not know the condition of ploughmen in England, but I know something of the state of that class in Scotland, and I am certain that few in this country would be pleased with the comparison, or listen with patience to any proposal for a change of condition with the slaves. I know several prosperous farmers, renting lands at more than £100. a year, who were formerly ploughmen; I suspect few slaves rise to such respectability. Our artists and miners cannot be forced to their employments, nor kept at them against their mind; they follow them for wages, and may leave them when they see better. This is a privilege denied to the Negroes. Such complaints as these are a disgrace to Englishmen; if true, they want prudence and spirit, which I hope is not the case with those who consider slavery "an imaginary case of distress," and who are entitled to very little sympathy themselves.

He says, "The fact is self-evident, that there is tenfold more crime, with consequent executions and imprisonments, in this boasted land of liberty, than in our colonies, taking an equal number of slaves and self-styled freemen. What, then, (he asks) is liberty the cause of vice or mismanagement? Either, then, the slaves are better managed, or liberty is productive of crime, imprisonment, and death." Your friend is more ready with assertions than with proofs. If he will give a close comparison of the *crimes and executions* in the West Indies and in Britain for a number of years, he will probably find it little to the honour of the planters. If crimes are less frequent there than in Britain, executions are much more so; slaves are kept in such bondage there, that they have little time or opportunity either to commit crime or perform duties. Would he wish to see the people of Britain reduced to the same state, and to have them managed by their rulers like cattle? In times of prosperity, I believe they would spurn such direction and controul; it would, then, be disgraceful to them if they desire it in the time of adversity. When

people require their rulers to provide and manage for them, they resign their freedom.

After telling Mr. Cropper, that he knows that several persons are confined in the cells of Newgate, merely for matters of opinion publicly expressed: he asks, and when will you ever convene a meeting for the promotion of freedom in this respect? The confinement of these men should be openly censured by all; but it is needless to expect that Mr. Cropper or any other sincere Christian will ever convene a meeting to petition on such a subject. In proportion as men are devout they will endeavour to suppress all arguments that offend their devotion, even by force. It would be well if unbelievers would do their duty in that respect themselves. Has your Liverpool friend, or any other person there, ever convened a meeting, or sent a petition to Parliament in behalf either of these men or the cause for which they are suffering? I know by experience, that reformers and sceptics generally are very careless about such petitions, that they will sign one when it is prepared and brought to them, but most of them would rather spend a shilling in the public-house than give a penny as a part of the expence of it.

Your *feeling friend* ascribes the disaffection, revolt, and consequent carnage among the Negroes at Demerara last year to the hopes excited by the hasty interference, and presumptuous attempts of the abolitionists to assist the slaves in getting emancipation or freedom; thus rendering them miserable, restless, and desperate. This is a gross misrepresentation of the intention of the abolitionists. They wished to better the condition of the slaves, but not to set them free, which should be their aim, but your friend might observe, that the same charge is equally applicable to the advocates of reform and liberty every where. The Turkish government, or the Pacha of Egypt, might reproach the friends of the Greeks, as the cause of sedition and carnage with more truth than that with which he can upbraid the abolitionists. The carnage that took place among the Negroes at Demerara, and the ghastly heads exhibited on the walls and posts of that town; reflect indelible disgrace on the white inhabitants of that Colony, and when contrasted with the very few whites who were killed, it goes far to prove that the Europeans are *much more ferocious* than these *woolly-headed savages*.

Your worthy friend considers, that if the Negroes had thrown off the yoke of their masters, the soil would be neglected, labour reduced, and crops would fail, which he thinks would be an appalling picture indeed! This is truly mercantile philanthropy. In my opinion, if sugar cannot be produced by labour for wages, it ought not to be raised at all; neither in the East nor West Indies. Produce of every kind, in all countries, ought only to be raised by free labour: and the consumer ought to pay a price

sufficient to remunerate the cultivator; or else want it; but your friend seems more anxious to procure good sugar than he is to lessen human misery. That some of the natives of Hindostan are in a state of slavery is no reason why the condition of the slaves in the West Indies should not be ameliorated; they ought all to be emancipated both in the East and West Indies; but the state of the slaves in the West Indies being much the worst, and more within reach; it seems best to begin with them first. As to the merits of the British government of India it is far from being good, but it is certainly better than any of the native tyrannies of which we have got any account; yet as it is unnatural to them, and pernicious to us, I should be glad to hear of its overthrow, and a better native government established in its stead. Its fall by destroying influence would likely promote the cause of freedom in Britain.

Your friend's eulogium on the valour of the Burmese, in defending their native plains against "our inroads upon their religion, country, and laws," might pass for a piece of bitter irony, as it is all contrary to facts. The Burmese are more ferocious than the African Negroes, and in the war they seem to have shewn no valour. They have behaved quite dastardly; but just in such a way as might be expected, *or wished*, in defence of a tyrannical government, barbarous laws, and a detestable superstition.

In comparing the condition of the slaves in Bermuda with the people of Britain, he says, how few in this country enjoy the healthful blessing of a garden? And by a question he implies, that every recreation and pastime of a public and healthful nature is put down in Britain, and that the labourers, our most useful class of people, are reduced to the solitary injurious enjoyment of ardent liquors at the tavern. This whole statement is void of truth. In most of our villages and country towns the people either have, or may have, a small garden; in large old towns, on account of the crowded state of the buildings, this cannot be obtained; but the authorities are not to be blamed for that. I know not of any recreation or pastime of a public nature that is put down. They are rather encouraged; and so far are the public authorities from encouraging the labouring classes to drink at the tavern, that they endeavour to prevent the pernicious practice as much as they can. If the labourers drink in the tavern they are to blame themselves, not the authorities.

His account of the condition of East Indian slaves is nearly as *accurate as the rest of his assertions*—but if really true, he ought to call another meeting on their behalf, and lay his information before it; and endeavour to get up another petition for these slaves in the East, rather than strive to obstruct a partial good done to them in the West.

Your friend seems very apprehensive that the measures of the abolitionists will injure "the interests of the lawful proprietors of

West Indian estates," he seems more anxious to secure the unjust power of the planters than the protection of the slaves; the recovery of their freedom is out of his view; but he ought to recollect that slaves being originally carried away by force, they are not more lawful property in the West Indies than Englishmen would be in Algiers or Morocco, consequently, it is our duty to release them as soon as possible.

He says, "were you, Sir, to found a petition to the House of Commons, beseeching the interference of government between the invading and barbarous Turk, and the suffering, yielding, Greek, disinterested pure philanthropy would be demonstrated beyond a doubt: there we behold men, women, and children, exposed to all the horrors of famine and the sword, defending their properties and lives to the last gasp, but no helping hand is stretched out to their assistance, no voice raised to stop the indiscriminate massacre of the noblest and most beautiful of the human species." This declamatory passage is wholly inaccurate. Every friend to freedom and humanity should certainly give his assistance to the Greeks; but the Negroes in the West Indies are kept in a state of much severer bondage than ever the Greeks were in under the Turks, and were it not for their present perilous condition it would display impartial philanthropy to begin with the Negroes first. The Greeks have defended their lives and property very poorly—certainly not to the last gasp, but as well as could have been expected, considering their former condition. There has been many a helping hand stretched out to their assistance, and there would have been more, if they had behaved better. Many a voice has been raised in their favour, but not so many as there should have been, which is the greater shame to Christians. I hope your friend has contributed something to their assistance.

They are certainly a people who deserve a better fate than they have met; but they are not the noblest and most beautiful of the human species—they are not superior to Englishmen, and their ancestors who have been so much praised were as cruel slave-masters as ever exercised authority. The Spartans were the most unfeeling and tyrannical masters that ever disgraced the name of men: rather more so than West Indian or American planters, who are bad enough. The distress in the manufacturing districts referred to by your friend is much to be deplored, it is the duty both of government and individuals to assist in lessening it; and when better days arrive, I hope the operatives will remember the present, and learn by this severe lesson, to lay up something to guard against want, which will assist them in recovering their freedom.

Yours truly,

ROBT. AFFLECK.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE REPUBLICAN."

SIR,

I WAS very much delighted at reading your critical examination of William Allen's Address to the Students at Guy's Hospital: insomuch, that I am induced to solicit you to make a similar examination of Mason Good's "Book of Nature," wherein you may find very unjust censures on Atheists. You may observe, that he has asserted, that it was the object of those illustrious philosophers who shone with such lustre at the commencement of the French Revolution; to degrade the human race by endeavouring to prove that true happiness is to be found no where but in a life of ignorance, such a life as that of a savage. Now it is well known among unprejudiced beings, that all those philosophers, with the exception of Rousseau, have affirmed that happiness is incompatible with ignorance and inseparable from virtue. Notwithstanding, this author has strenuously endeavoured to support his calumny, and has actually devoted a few pages to refute the accusation. This work abounds in inconsistency, and flimsy reasoning. Observe, Sir, the following—"It is something more than matter, observes one class of philosophers; for matter itself is essentially unintelligent, and is utterly incapable of thought. But this is to speak with more confidence than we are warranted, and unbecomingly to limit the power of the Creator. It has already appeared, that we know nothing of the essential properties of matter. If it be capable of gravitation; of elective attractions; of life; of instinct; of sensation, there does not appear to be any absurdity in supposing it may be capable of thought."—Vol. iii. page 22.

In vol. i., page 38, he says, "if matter is capable of assuming any kind, it must have been equally capable of assuming every kind, and, of course, of exhibiting intelligent effects without an intelligent cause, which would be utter nonsense." Is not this inconsistency? Though M. Good supposes, that matter is capable of thought, he still maintains that the soul is immortal! He has even written in this work a chapter or two with the view of proving that it is immortal! In the dark ages of antiquity, when men, through their ignorance, could not conceive that matter may be so modified as to produce thought, we are not surprised that they should maintain the dogma of the immortality of the soul; but in an enlightened age, when men are forced, by the conviction of their senses, to admit, that matter thinks, we are surprised, that they should still retain this absurd dogma, which Mason Good has cherished.

This work, Sir, is replete with such absurdities. Shall I have

the pleasure to anticipate that they will be publicly exposed? Will you condescend to write to me on the subject? * Excuse my zeal, I beg, as it has espoused a good cause. What design can be more noble than that of crushing fanaticism and superstition, as they are prejudicial to the human race.

I remain, your devoted admirer,

And humble servant,

JOHN JONES.

* I have not read Mr. Mason Good's book; but my attention has been called to it of late by different persons. I cannot, at this moment, make a pledge of taking it up, as I have many pledges yet unperformed; but if I want an author of the kind for examination, I shall prefer Mason Good, as a living author, as a medical man, and as the avowed friend of Dr. Gregory, whose letters on the evidences of the Christian Religion, I consider, I have fairly refuted, with less knowledge upon the subject than I have since attained. "EVERY MAN'S BOOK; OR, WHAT IS GOD?" being the discussion with William Allen, is on sale as a pamphlet distinct from "The Republican," and with some slight additions and corrections. It will, by and bye, be made a match book, as to size, with the "EVERY WOMAN'S BOOK; OR, WHAT IS LOVE?" To know *what is God*, and *what is love*, appear to me to be the two grand points whereupon to lay the foundation of human happiness.—R. C.

THE following piece of correspondence came from the West End of the Town, and we presume that it is a sort of Christian apology for adultery from some person in the condition of Captain Garth and Lady Astley. It was anonymous, posted in Piccadilly, and rejected once for non-payment; but on a second presentation, we thought the apologetical notion worth twopence, and so purchased it, the postage being the highest price that we give for a manuscript of any kind; and then only when we know the writer, or think the article worth that price. To pay for all correspondences sent would be a worse tax than either Church or State has yet imposed.—EDITOR.

To the Editor of the Republican.

SIR,

Gift.—I understand this word to mean an *extraordinary* power, conferred on man especially by God—St. Paul's 1st Epistle to Cor.; so in respect to this gift of continency declares it, ver. 1 and 40.

I read in the marriage service that amongst the purposes for which marriage was ordained, one was this, viz. that persons

such as have not the *gift* of continency might keep themselves undefiled.

The *gift* of continency ! Then continency is a *spiritual gift*, is it reasonable, then, to punish a man because he do not possess a *spiritual gift*, as well might he be open to punishment for the colour of his skin. You reply he may marry : if he have not the *spiritual gift* of continency he may marry ; but will that insure to him the *spiritual gift* of continency ? If it do not, will it not subject him to the *severer* penalties of the law ? Does he not in marriage for the experiment risk his fortune ; his reputation ; his happiness ; his very existence, and almost his soul's salvation, and that of his children ? There are various causes which may operate to render matrimony nugatory in such a matter, and which the laws will not admit sufficient to dissolve the bond. Is it reasonable then to punish the husband, who, not having the *spiritual gift* of continency, complied with your alternative, but did not receive in consequence the promised *gift* of continency, nor did you secure to him the full rights and conveniences of a husband, and yet will not release him, but subject him to *severer* penalties, and observe because he have not a *spiritual gift* !

I consider it blasphemous rebellion against God to punish the being he has created, because he has so created him as he thought fit, and still more so when you have insisted on his adopting your remedies, and you have failed to supply him with the *spiritual gift*.

An idiot by parity of reason might with equal justice be subject to penal laws, because God created him without the *spiritual gift* of sense, and he could not explain an abstruse passage in the Scriptures, or solve a problem in Euclid, or a patient suffering under a malady be executed because the medicine of the physician sent to attend him failed to cure him.

I read in chap. xviii. of the Acts of the Apostles, that one Simon Magus offered the Apostles money to give him the power to work miracles, but Peter said unto him, " Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the *gift* of God may be purchased with money.

I say, then, that he that hath not the *gift* of continency may when you offer him marriage as a means of obtaining that *gift* as well reprove you for supporting such means of obtaining a *gift* of God.

Incontinency is inability to restrain the appetite according to Milton's definition ; and the learned Johnson tells us, continency is a command of oneself, and by the authority of the form of solemnization of matrimony in our Church, I am instructed to regard it as a *gift* of God ; it is not reasonable, then, man should be punished, because he have not been blessed by the Creator of him with this his favour, by man.

But how inconsistent is this with what the priest has but a moment before pronounced, viz. that matrimony was *not ordained to satisfy mens carnal appetites*. Suppose an individual not having the *gift* of continency marry, and his wife become cripple, insane, diseased, or the like, the law will not release this man from his bond, or suffer him take any other woman to wife: but not having the *gift* of continency he cohabits with another woman, and he is punished by human laws. How unjust! Surely, where it is clear there are such causes as preclude a man the conveniences of matrimony, he ought to be released his bond on a fair provision to his wife, and her offspring being made. How many suffer in reputation as incontinent, where the truth cannot be advanced as to the cause, and which would render an individual an object of pity and excite sympathy rather than condemnation. However deficient a man be of this *gift* of God, he is much safer single than married, and his remedy much more certain in the one case than the other, and his punishment much less severe. Dreadful to contemplate are the risks a man runs who marries, and few are there who escape destruction of happiness or fortune, or some other matter equally dear to him and his existence, who enters that state, nevertheless let man take to his mate, and abide with her constant and faithful.

OBSERVATIONS ON "O. O.'s" ARTICLE ON "GOD OF NATURE, MATTER, MOTION, AND MIND."

"Motion cannot originate itself, nor can matter move itself without some moving agent, so that I must ascribe motion to some other source, and as I perceive in myself a capacity for motion, in what I call mind, or the source of my volition; so by a natural process of reasoning do I ascribe motion in general to some similar principle."—O. O.

LOGICALLY as O. O. attempts to argue this question, the undispelled superstition of his youth leads him into error. He concludes without a connection between his proposition and his conclusion, that mind has a capacity to produce motion, calls this the only source of motion, and infers a general mind or something distinct from matter, which he names "God of Nature," as the cause of general motion.

What capacity has mind to produce motion? Mind or volition moves nothing without the mechanical aid of matter; which removes O. O.'s third point, and brings us back to matter as the only perceptible source of motion. We know nothing of motion but that it is the action of matter upon matter. In all cases of motion, this is perceptible: nothing farther. Motion, as a principle distinct from matter, is not known. For instance, Mrs. Carlile is annoying me with her tongue, while I want quietness to

consider and not to hear the motions of matter. There is sound, there is motion; but the tongue, the glottis, the larynx, &c. form the matter which produces them. Motion is as properly a quality of matter, and mind is as properly called a quality of body, as sound is a quality of the motions of matter. If there be a general mind, as the source of the general motions of matter, **WHAT IS THE SOURCE OF THAT GENERAL MIND?** We find matter acting in all motions; but we never find mind distinct from matter. To say that matter cannot move itself is to set aside a perceptible fact for the sake of making room for the superstitious hypothesis of a moving God. If we consider matter under the head of its moving particles, we find that one moves the other, while the constant round of motion leaves the united particles in a state of rest or sameness. A storm on any part of the earth, though it moves particles on the surface of the earth, though it puts the sea and the atmosphere in violent motion, though it throws down buildings, uproots trees, removes even mountains, affects not the motion of the earth, is not a perceptible motion in relation to the planetary motions: the individual planetary motions, again, do not affect or relate to the motions of solar systems: and the motions of the solar systems, again, may be referred to the general system of matter, as not affecting it. So that, instead of seeking the source of motion in the major system of matter, or what O. O. calls God of Nature, we find it only and entirely in the minor system of particles.

Thus matter is shewn to be the source of motion and mind, and nothing is shewn by O. O., or by any other Theist, as the source of matter.

R. C.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

UNPAID letters have no claim to notice. We open them, and, seeing that they ought to have been paid, return them to the postman without further notice. The tax upon a man who stands before the public as a writer or publisher of a periodical work is intolerable, if he have to pay postage for every letter that is dropped into the post-office for him. Many are put in for mischief, without any writing but the superscription; but the persons who are guilty of such tricks may be assured, that all the injury they do is to waste their paper, time, &c., and to give a little trouble at the post-office. That honourable establishment never allows an individual to be taxed improperly through its medium. Castigator Amicus may here see the cause of his anger, and learn, that, as insults cannot be anonymously presented, they cannot be wisely resented.

With all possible esteem for Mr. Lowe, I deem his Lecture,

good as it is in itself, a subject too stale for the readers of "The Republican." I flatter myself, that they have been schooled to form a class above mere critical examinations of that book of ignorance, "The Bible." Seven years ago, I should have rejoiced to have received such an article with a name to it; but now, we have carried the question of religion beyond "The Bible;" and the bare admission for examination, that the book is an authority, is not to be tolerated. Enough has been written and published against it, which is not to be refuted. To raise doubts of its validity is a first necessary step; but as soon as those doubts have been raised, the enquirer should be fed with a knowledge of things, or matter and morals.

Mr. Lowe's paper will be kept for his order.

R. C.

ERRATA.

SOME serious errors and omissions crept into the article in last week's Number, on machinery, population, &c., signed J. F. through the waste of getting up the Number which Bartholomew Fair inflicted upon the compositor, or rather upon the Editor, for on him the penalty of the error falls.

There should have been five propositions or conclusions at the beginning, instead of four. The fourth was omitted and should have stood thus:—

"4. That I consider '*the great increase of population*' a piece of political twattle."

There were some few omissions and substitutions of words which did not affect the general argument of J. F. though they affected his style and his accuracy of quotation.

In the phrenological sarcasm, *lump* was substituted for *bump*, words that are first cousins, if not nearer of kin.

On the first discovery of the errors, a thought was entertained, as a matter of justice to J. F. as a controversial correspondent, to reprint his article correctly; and this shall be done if he deems the force of his argument weakened by the errors.

J. F. may be assured, that there was no intentional omission. Such a liberty is never taken in "The Republican" with so able and respected a correspondent; nor, indeed, with any controversial correspondent in a particular controversy. Not being bound to accord with the conclusions of every correspondent, and professing to encourage free discussion, opposing articles are often allowed to pass unnoticed by the Editor, and the criticism left to the reader.

R. C.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 62, Fleet Street.—All Correspondences for "The Republican," to be left at the place of publication.